

**SEEMIG National Strategy for enhancing migration data production
and utilization for Romania**
*(Proposal for a national strategy on data enhancement and
utilization on migration, labour market and human capital)*

Romanian Institute for Research on National Minorities



2014

Jointly for our common future

The national strategy was developed in the framework of SEEMIG – Managing Migration and its Effects in SEE – Transnational Actions towards Evidence-based Strategies. SEEMIG is a strategic project funded by the European Union’s South-East Europe Programme. Project code: SEEMIG - SEE/C/0006/4.1/X

The national strategy was prepared within the SEEMIG activity *Strategies, capacity building and transnational dialogue* coordinated by the University of Trento.

The information published here reflects the authors’ views and the Managing Authority is not liable for any use that may be made of the information concerned.

Authors: Romanian Institute for Research on National Minorities.

This work is subject to copyright. All rights reserved, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned.

Information for reproducing excerpts from this report can be found at www.seemig.eu. Inquiries can also be directed to: the Romanian Institute for Research on National Minorities, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, 400697 str. Gavril Muzicescu or requested from t_kiss77@yahoo.com

Suggested citation: Romanian Institute for Research on National Minorities (2014): SEEMIG National Strategy for enhancing migration data production and utilization for Romania (Proposal for a national strategy on data enhancement and utilization on migration, labour market and human capital)

<http://www.seemig.eu/downloads/outputs/SEEMIGNationalStrategyRomania.pdf>

1. INTRODUCTION

The *National Strategy for enhancing migration data production and utilization* is primarily based on the findings of SEEMIG research activities. The *Country report on existing data production system and major data sources in Romania*; the *Dynamic historical analysis of longer term migratory, labour market and human capital processes in Romania*; the *Action Plan Romania*; the *National foresight report in Romania* and the *Focus group on immigration trends, integration and labour market in Romania* are the major sources of the present Romanian National Strategy.¹ We also make use of the *Comparative analysis of existing major population projections in SEEMIG countries* and major official strategies and analyses on demographic and migratory processes. Out of these strategies and analyses the *Extended Report on Social Risks in Romania* of the Commission of the Romanian Presidency for the Analysis of Social and Demographic Risks represented our major source of inspiration.²

The Romanian National Strategy highlights the most important problems and policy relevant consequences resulting from the migratory, demographic and labour market processes. First, the major migratory, demographic and labour market trends will be outlined based on the *Dynamic historical analysis of longer term migratory, labour market and human capital processes in Romania*. Second, some of the major policy issues and challenges related to migratory, demographic and labour market processes will be presented. This part of the strategy is based on the results of the foresight exercise, the conclusions of the focus group, and existing policy centered analyses and strategies elaborated on the request of the Romanian state authorities. Third, some major problems related to the existing system of data production on migratory processes in Romania will be outlined. This part of the strategy is based primarily on the *Country report on existing data production system* and *Action Plan*. While the Action Plan targets the experts and officials engaged in managing the effects of the migratory and demographic processes, the present national strategy targets a much larger public composed by stakeholders, politicians and opinion leaders. As such, the National Strategy summarizes the major points of the Action Plan. Similarly to the Action Plan, the timeframe of the proposed policy measures is 2015-2019.

2. BACKGROUND

After the Word War II, Romania became part of the Socialist Camp. Like all other Eastern European countries under the influence of the Soviet Union, Romania became a single-party system, whereas the centrally planned system ruled the economic relations. The change of the regime in December 1989 altered Romania's geopolitical orientation. In the early 1990s, it became clear that the Western (European) orientation had no real alternatives. This was reflected by the fact that a strong consensus has been formed among the Romanian elites regarding European Union (EU) and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) integration. During the process of transition reforms, the relative economic position and the demographic prospects of the country have considerably deteriorated. The 1990s were characterized by a deep economic and social crisis, and not only because of the sharp decrease of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita. The main problem of the period was the sudden collapse of the industrial production. The number of people employed in the industrial sector

¹ Detailed information about SEEMIG reports and events are included in Annex 1.

² See http://www.presidency.ro/static/CPARSDR_raport_extins.pdf

halved from 4.169 million in 1989 to 2.004 million in 2000. It is important to note that the recovery of the economy began later than in the majority of the Eastern European countries such as Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovakia or Poland. The time period between 2000 and 2008 was characterized by an intensive growth of the Romanian economy. This rapid growth came after a two-decade-long period of stagnation and decline. The GDP per capita reached its 1989 (or 1979, because between 1979 and 1989 the GDP per capita was stagnating) level in 2005. The comparison to the world average shows, however, that even at its peak point in 2008, the relative economic position of the country was significantly worse than it was in the last decades of socialism. In 2007, Romania joined the European Union, but the period of high rate of economic growth was drastically interrupted by the general financial crisis in 2009. As for the expectations regarding the future, the financial crisis put an end also to the expectations shared by the majority of the population, namely that Romania could reach the Western standards of social development and living conditions in a relatively short time.

The regime change of 1989 represents a major turning point in the demographic development of the country. Until 1989, the Romanian population grew dynamically, thanks primarily to the pro-natalist policies enforced from 1967 on. In 1989, the country's population exceeded 23 million persons. After 1989, a radical population loss occurred, which can be considered a drastic decline even in the broader Eastern European context. According to the 2011 census, the population has fallen to 20.1 million, which means a population loss of 13 percent compared to figures from 1989.

One of the factors causing this radical decrease in population size was the decline in the total fertility rate (and in the number of newborns). The most important factor however was the negative net migration. In spite of closed borders, the phenomenon of emigration existed during the times of state socialism too: between 1948 and 1989, a relatively high net migration loss (783,578 persons) was officially registered in Romania. However the process of emigration from Romania intensified only after the turn of the millennium. In October 1999, the European Commission recommended the starting of the accession negotiations with Romania. As part of the integration process, in 2002, Romanian citizens have been exempted from visa in the majority of the EU countries. As already mentioned, at the beginning of 2007, Romania became an EU member. The new legal status of the Romanian citizens within the EU resulted in an increase of the volume of emigration. Currently, according to the immigration statistics of the main receiving countries, an approximate number of 3 million Romanian citizens live abroad. The main contextual determinants of these migration outflows were the intensive deindustrialization and the growing numbers of individuals who found themselves sidelined on the changed labour market.

With regard to the impact of emigration on the labour market, two periods can be distinguished: the first one includes the 1990s and the very beginning of 2000s, whereas the second starts by the mid-2000s. In the first period, due to the economic transition, the number of available workplaces radically dropped in Romania and migration emerged as a reaction to the incapacity of the Romanian economy to create jobs and absorb the existing labour force. Seen from the perspective of the state, migration functioned as a safety valve, because significant strata of the population who were at the risk of becoming beneficiaries of social assistance left the country. Therefore, migration lowered the social costs of the transition and reduced the risks of social tensions. From 2001 to 2008, the Romanian economy grew with an impressive average annual rate of 6.2%, which positioned Romania at the top of the growing economies in the region. According to a survey taken in 2007, approximately 15% of the companies active in sectors characterized by intensive growth – T&C (textile and clothing) industry, constructions, trade, the financial and other services, and HoReCa (hotels, restaurants and catering) – reported personnel deficit. The most severe problems were reported by the firms active in the T&C sector. These labour shortages were also directly linked to the emigration of Romanian labour force. Romanians preferred to work abroad in constructions, commerce, hotel trade, domestic and care services (including women who previously worked in the textile industry at home) and earn at least twice of what they could receive by doing the same job at home.

In 2009, the Romanian economy experienced a sharp contraction. Since 2011 there has been only a small recovery. Even in the crisis context, the Romanian labour market failed to meet the needs of employers, and the shortage was above the average both in a European and a global perspective. For example, in 2010, 36% of the companies in Romania declared having difficulties filling the job vacancies, in particular in the following domains: engineers, skilled traders, sales representatives etc. Analysts consider that the causes of the labour supply's deficiency are structural, mostly related to emigration, and forecast an absolute shortage in approximately 20 years.

In what concerns immigration, one can observe that it does not compensate for work-force shortage, and the number of annually emitted work permits is quite low. Although in 2008 the yearly quota of work permits issued for third country nationals had to be increased, still only 15 thousand permits were issued. As mentioned above, the economic dynamics of the 2000s conjoined with the amplified emigration of Romanians led to a workforce shortage in some economic sectors. In this context, immigrant labour seemed to be a mid-term solution for addressing the problem. However, the predictions made in 2008, which assumed a considerable increase in labour-driven immigration up to a stock of 200-300,000 persons (1.1-1.4% of the population) until 2013-2015, proved to be unsubstantiated. The global economic crisis curbed the ascending curve of immigration to Romania.

Emigration and fertility decline led not only to population loss but also to an accelerated ***ageing of the Romanian population***. Due to the population policy of the former political regime, in the early 1990s, the country had a relatively young population. According to the 1992 census, 23 percent of the total population was below 15 years and 10 percent above 65. This positive picture changed radically, however. According to the 2011 census, the age structure of the Romanian population was more unfavorable than the most pessimistic scenarios of previous demographic forecasts. The number of persons below 15 years decreased by 38.4 percent, of those between 15 and 64 by 9.4 percent, while the number of those above 65 years increased by 29.5 percent. This trend of the age structure will certainly continue. The ageing process is faster than in the Western European countries. One factor lying behind this trend is paradoxically the population policy of the former regime. Contrary to other Eastern Bloc countries (such as Czechoslovakia or Hungary) the main tools of the Romanian population policy were not positive/material stimuli but legal penalties. The criminalization of the abortion and the blocking of the spread of modern contraceptive tools were of particular importance. The main consequence was a highly unequal age structure. As an immediate result of the prohibition of the abortion in 1966, the number of births doubled in 1967 compared to the previous year. The number of births in the 1970s and 1980s has been also relatively high. During the early 1990s however the number of newborns has dropped with 40 percent. One can foresee that a major problem will occur with the retirement of the persons born in the 1960s and 1970s .

3. MAIN ISSUES/CHALLENGES RELATED TO MIGRATION IN ROMANIA

According to all population forecasts, Romania will face in the following decades a rapid demographic process of population loss³, the main causes being the very low fertility rates (1.3 children/women) and the continuous negative net migration.

The ageing of the population is one of the most important demographic challenges in Romania. The imbalanced age structure will most probably produce a ***rapid collapse of the pension and health-care system***.

³ Pilinská, Viera - Vaňo, Boris (2013): Comparative analysis of existing major population projections in eight South-East European countries. Paper developed within the project 'SEEMIG Managing Migration and Its Effects – Transnational Actions Towards Evidence Based Strategies'. <http://www.seemig.eu/downloads/outputs/SEEMIGOverviewofpopulationprojections.pdf>

Romania is mainly a country of emigration, so it has to deal primarily with the phenomenon of outmigration, and with the existence of a large Romanian diaspora (of about 3 million people) in different Western European and North American countries. Emigration is certainly the most important factor affecting the country's demographic evolution. During the last two decades of massive out-migration, migratory practices have become deeply culturally embedded. Additionally, migration could be conceived in some Romanian regions as a cultural tradition that has a significant past. This is the situation of most of the rural and economically peripheral regions of the country. These peripheral regions were relatively overpopulated (compared to the absorption capacity of the agriculture) until the 1980s. Many people from these regions emigrated to the United States at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries. During the socialist period, internal migration was of primal importance. Under the given circumstances the relatively high level of out-migration will most probably continue. ***The main challenge regarding emigration is whether complete migration (meaning definitive emigration) or circular migration will prevail.***

The latter implies that young people involved in international migration will utilize the resources gained during migration, such as knowledge or other types of capital, when they return home. In this respect, the fundamental issue is whether the links between the emigrant communities and their local, regional and national sending community can or cannot be maintained. The ability of a sending society (as Romania) to capitalize the possibilities lying in new techniques of communication and transnational forms of social organization is crucial for maintaining the links with emigrant communities. The *Focus group* and the *Foresight exercise* revealed that active governmental programs should be initiated to achieve this aim. These programs should also provide financial recourses to local governments to develop strategies of strengthening local identity and maintaining transnational bonds with emigrant communities. This does not imply however only annually organized reunions of emigrants, but also inexpensive housing and increased labour market reintegration chances of young returnees. The new techniques of communication that enable the creation and maintenance of transnational communities are also used strategically by the national and local government and by the civil organizations engaged in the project. Different types of internet-based social media allow emigrants to maintain a daily virtual presence in the sending society.

Until now, the Romanian policy measures to promote circular migration were not very effective, although some positive examples can be mentioned. Romania (alongside to some restrictive measures to control out-migration) has taken steps to promote a system of managed migration (forms of periodic, circular migration) since the 1990s. At the turn of the millennium and in the EU pre-accession period, Romania signed bilateral agreements regulating the migration of labour force with Switzerland (2000), Hungary (2001), Portugal (2001, 2002), Luxembourg (2001), Spain (2002), France (2004), Germany (1991, 1992, 2005) and Italy (1996, 2006, 2007). In 2002, the Labour Force Migration Office, an authority in charge with both the recruitment and mediation of Romanian labour force, was set up. This office initiated bilateral contracts with relevant state agencies from receiving countries (Germany or Spain) or private employers intending, to promote a more organized and controlled form of short term, possibly circular migration of the Romanian workforce. From 2006 (and markedly after 2007), the Romanian authorities started to offer primarily cultural assistance to Romanian emigrant communities via a special structure of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs responsible for the Romanian Diaspora, the Department for Romanians Living Abroad. After 2007, measures to promote return migration and reintegration of returnees were undertaken. So, the *2008-2010 Action Plan* concerning the return of Romanian citizens working abroad was adopted⁴, and concrete actions were undertaken in this sense, for instance, information campaigns on the labour opportunities in Romania. Further measures for promoting circular migration and measures to assist integration

⁴ Government Decision 187/2008, Published in the Official Bulletin nr. 163/03.03.2008.

<http://www.mmuncii.ro/pub/imagemanager/images/file/Legislatie/HOTARARI-DE-GUVERN/HG187-2008.pdf>

include educational support, support for initiating economic activities etc. Even a bilateral agreement, stipulating the collaboration in the field of return and reintegration of the Romanian immigrants, was signed between Romania and Spain in 2009.

In the medium term, one of the main challenges of Romania will be **to attract immigrants to substitute for the emigrant working force**. According to the Foresight exercise, the immigration is conceived currently by many stakeholders and experts as return migration. The majority of them do not consider that Romania could transform from a country of emigration to a country of immigration in a short or medium term. The level of immigration is currently very low. Despite low immigration, the Romanian focus group focused (next to the labour market consequences of the migration) on the problems of immigrants and their integration into the Romanian society. With the focus group we succeeded to identify some key policy areas concerning immigrants in Romania. One major problem is the weak communication between the Romanian officials and immigrant communities. This problem could be solved through the strengthening of the network of community mediators. A second challenge is that immigrants are completely missing from the priorities of the local authorities. Hence, local authorities should be involved in the integration of immigrants. A third issue is that of the poor Romanian language proficiency of the immigrants. The Romanian language courses could fulfill the needs of linguistic and cultural integration of immigrants.

4. KEY PROBLEMS IN THE DATA SYSTEM

This part of the Romanian National Strategy is based primarily on *Action plan (AP)* and *Country report on existing data production systems and major data sources in Romania*. These reports outlined already the major problems of the Romanian data production system on migration and population stock. Based on these documents the following five key problems of the Romanian data production system on migration have been identified:

1. Lack of access of the relevant statistical offices/ institutions to individual data
2. Lack of integrated data on migration and the lack of statistical use of different data sources regarding migration
3. Steps toward the harmonization of definitions in different migration data sets
4. Additional module on emigrant household members in the Labor Force Survey (LFS)
5. Regular monitoring and analysis of the LFS surveys in the main destination countries of the Romanian migration.

4.2.1. Lack of access of the relevant statistical offices/institutions to individual data

Law No. 266/2009 regulates the organization and functioning of official statistical data collection. According to the law, the National Institute of Statistics is the institution responsible for statistical data collection on international migration. An exhaustive survey is carried out for immigrants entering and the emigrants leaving the country. However administrative data on migration are not used for statistical purposes. The Ministry of Internal Affairs - Directorate for Persons' Record and Database Management is responsible for the de-registration of emigrants. The population register keeps records of (all but only) Romanian citizens irrespectively of their country of residence (whether or not they reside in Romania). Citizens with legal residence in Romania are registered at their official permanent addresses (and not at their usual residence, if this differs from the permanent address). Citizens who have (officially) left the country and do not have a permanent address in Romania are registered at their last permanent address, mentioning that they reside abroad. Public Services for Persons' Record from District 1 Bucharest issues ID cards to citizens who have never had permanent

address in Romania (ethnic Romanians from Moldova and Ukraine who acquired Romanian citizenship). Extraterritorial Romanian citizens enter the population register when they receive a Romanian ID card. Consequently, the Ministry of Internal Affairs - Directorate for Persons' Record and Database Management holds a database a) on (officially registered) emigrant stock and b) new Romanian citizens residing in neighboring countries (Ukraine, Republic of Moldova). These data are not used at all for statistical purposes.

4.2.2. Lack of integrated data on migration and the lack of the statistical use of different data sources regarding migration

The Ministry of Internal Affairs – General Inspectorate for Immigration is responsible for the registration of foreign citizens in Romania. The aim of data collection regarding foreign citizens is not statistical but administrative (the Romanian authorities want to control the cross-border movement of third-country citizens). They are registered - separately from Romanian citizens - in three separate registers. (a) In the register of short term visa owners enter only some non-EU and non-EEA citizens staying for a short period of time (less than 3 months). (b) All foreign citizens who stay more than 3 months in Romania have to register themselves in the registers of foreign nationals staying in Romania. However, (c) EU/EEA/Swiss Confederation citizens are registered separately from other foreign nationals. The MIA does not transfer data from these registers to NIS, and consequently these data sources are not integrated in the Romanian data production system on migration.

Another authority responsible for migration related data collection is the National Agency for Citizenship. It is responsible for registering and solution of citizenship applications coming from territories which were part of the interwar Greater Romania (in fact, applications of ethnic Romanians from Moldova and Ukraine). These applicants are treated preferentially, and their applications are registered separately from other citizenship applications. These data are not transmitted to the National Institute of Statistics and data are not accessible for statistical purposes. Moreover, there are no publicly available data at all on the process of (re)acquisition of the Romanian citizenship. So, this issue is not at all integrated in the Romanian statistical data production system.⁵

Another major problem is that the administrative registers and the statistical data collection process of the NIS are not (or in the best case are only partially) integrated. NIS has its own system of data production, which is independent from (or parallel with) primary institutions responsible for registration. This is not true only in the case of population, but also in the case of educational statistics, for instance. Here NIS and the Ministry of Education have parallel systems of data production and both deliver data on the educational system (which are, of course, highly inconsistent). We consider the working of these parallel and non-integrated systems ineffective and a waste of resources.

4.2.3. Steps toward the harmonization of definitions in different migration data sets

In Romania, following the change of the political regime, the statistical and administrative definitions of "population" have become highly incongruent. The lack of a consistently used definition for the country's population has a decisive effect on the Romanian data production system. During the period of state-socialism, there was a steadily used definition applied by all institutions involved in population registration. In this era, *the Romanian population was defined as the totality of Romanian citizens with legal residence/address in Romania*. Until the 2002 census, statistical definition of the population was similar. In 2002 however, the National Institute of Statistics changed the statistical definition of the Romanian population. The long-term resident foreign citizens were included,

⁵ See Panaite coord. (2012)

whereas the Romanian citizens who were staying abroad for a long period of time (at least 1 year) were excluded.

Although the statistical definition of the population has changed, the logic of the population register (and other administrative data sources) remained unaltered. So, the population register contains all Romanian citizens irrespective of having or not having residence in Romania. Furthermore, the population register does not integrate the registers of foreign citizens residing in Romania. It is very important to stress that this led to a duality in the definitions applied to the Romanian population. On the one hand, there is the legal population of Romania meaning the totality of citizens whether or not they reside in Romania, and on the other hand, the usual population of Romania meaning the totality of persons residing usually in Romania irrespective to their citizenship. The first (i.e. legal population) remained the *administrative definition of the population*, which differs considerably from the *statistical definition of the population* (i.e. usual population). In other words, the administrative definition of the Romanian population is still the definition elaborated during state socialism. This duality is a permanent source of confusions and inconsistencies, and hinders the integration of the administrative and statistical data production systems.

The definition of "immigrants" and "emigrants" (used by the National Institute of Statistics) follows the logic of the administrative (legal) definition of the population, and accordingly is not in line at all with the Eurostat recommendations. Emigrants (see the exhaustive survey carried out by NIS and the Ministry of Internal Affairs) are defined as Romanian citizens who leave the country in agreement with the Romanian authorities, in order to settle abroad. A serious problem linked to this definition is that foreign citizens who emigrate from Romania are not included (by definition) in the emigration statistics. Immigrants are defined as foreign citizens who come in Romania in agreement with Romanian authorities to settle their residence in the country. The complications here are due to the specification that immigrants are foreign citizens. First, as it was already mentioned, after 1990, Romanian authorities offered Romanian citizenship on preferential terms for former Romanian citizens (and their descendants) residing in neighboring countries (Republic of Moldova and Ukraine). They can obtain Romanian citizenship even without having Romanian residence. If new Romanian citizens from Moldova or Ukraine set their residence in Romania, they will not appear in migration statistics. Thus, it seems grounded to claim that the majority of effective in-migrants does not appear in NIS statistics as immigrants. The second category that immigration statistic does not include is that of returnees. Emigrants (even if they emigrate in agreement with Romanian authorities) remain registered in the population register because there are no incentives or sanctions to enforce deregistration. Hence, in case they choose to return, they do not have to register, therefore, there will be no traces left concerning their migration.

4.2.4. Additional module on emigrant household members in LFS

The sole possibility for migration-related secondary analyses in the LFS databases is the question regarding the location of the unit where the concerned person works. A possible answer here is that the workplace is situated abroad. In this case, the country of the workplace is registered. Due to the fact that LFS includes temporarily absent household members in the survey, it could be used as a valuable data source regarding short-term labour force emigration. However, the problem is that the LFS conducted in Romania managed to capture an extremely low number of household members working abroad (less than 1 percent of the active work force).

4.2.5. Regular monitoring and analysis of the LFS surveys in the main destination countries of the Romanian migration.

As Romania is first of all an emigration country, for the purposes of analyzing the Romanian migration, not only the Romanian LFS can be interesting, but the LFS performed in the main receiving countries too. For instance, in Italy or in Spain, Romanians constitute a considerable part of the work-

force. These surveys are of special interest because the Romanian LFS does not contain any specific questions regarding migration (e.g. Have you ever worked abroad? Do you plan to work abroad?).

Overview table:

Key Issue/Challenge	Lack of access of the relevant statistical offices/ institutions to individual data	Lack of integrated data on migration and the lack of the statistical use of different data sources regarding migration	Steps toward the harmonization of definitions in different migration data sets	Additional module on emigrant household members in LFS	Regular monitoring and analysis of the LFS surveys in the main destination countries of the Romanian migration.
Key proposed activities to handle the challenge	Statistical use of the population register regarding the a) officially registered emigrant stock; b) new Romanian citizens residing in neighboring countries (Ukraine, Republic of Moldova) registered in the population register.	Creation of a better integrated data production system involving relevant administrative data sources	Changing the definition of "immigrants" and "emigrants" used by the National Statistical Office	Adding questions to the core LFS questionnaire concerning emigration from Romania	Regular analysis and publication of data from of the LFS surveys of main receiving countries of the Romanian emigration
Level of intervention	National: legislative act	National: government and relevant data owners	National Statistical Office	National	Transnational
Relevant stakeholders	Romanian Government, National Institute of Statistics, Ministry of Internal Affairs	National Institute of Statistics, Ministry of Internal Affairs	National Statistical Office	National Institute of Statistics	Romanian Institute for Research on National Minorities

Relevant political level endorsers	National authorities working on migration issues	National authorities working on migration issues	National authorities working on migration issues, EUROSTAT	National authorities working on migration issues	National authorities working on migration issues
Previous policy attempts to tackle the issue (if any)	Law No. 266/2009 regulates the organization and functioning of official statistical data collection	-	-	LFS ad-hoc module in 2008	-
Short term (2/3 years) outcomes/achievements of the proposed activities	Modification of the Law No. 266/2009	Identifying the main points of the intervention; Establishing communication between relevant authorities Utilization of previous analyzes	Modification of the definitions Elaboration of a new methodology to collect data on immigrants and emigrants	Elaboration of additional LFS questions and the methodology of analysis	Elaboration of the methodology of analysis
Long-term (6/8 years or longer) outcomes/achievements of the activity	Identification of relevant data on migration Elaboration of a methodology of the statistical use of	Long term strategy for a better integrated data production system	Implementation of the new methodology	Implementation of the new LFS questionnaires	Regular monitoring and publications

Potential risks and suggested solution to overcome risks	Lack of financial resources, lack of political interest and cooperation between the relevant offices and data owners	Lack of financial resources, lack of political interest and cooperation between the relevant offices and data owners	Lack of financial resources and interest	Lack of financial resources and interest	Lack of financial resources
Links to national/EU level policies // transnational character	Romania will transmit better quality data on migratory processes towards Eurostat and other transnational databanks	Romania will transmit better quality data on migratory processes towards Eurostat and other transnational databanks	The definition of "immigrants" and "emigrants" will be harmonized with Eurostat recommendations	-	This constitutes a move towards a transnationally integrated analysis of the migratory processes
Financial feasibility and sustainability	The Romanian state budget should cover all expenses, but measures could be partially financed by EU funds	The Romanian state budget should cover all expenses, but measures could be partially financed by EU funds	The Romanian state budget should cover all expenses, but measures could be partially financed by EU funds	EU or national funds have to be found	EU or national funds have to be foundnd
Proposed monitoring of implementation	-	Follow up with statistical office	-		

5. SUGGESTIONS AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Better integration of the administrative data in the statistical data production system

As mentioned above, according to the Law No. 266/2009 on statistical data collection, the National Institute of Statistics is the institution responsible for statistical data collection on international migration. However, administrative data sources are extremely weakly integrated in statistical data production system. The population register, held by the Ministry of Internal Affairs for instance is not used at all for statistical purposes. This is the register of all Romanian citizens whether or not they have residence in Romania. Citizens, who (officially) left the country and have deregistered, are also included in the population register. Another relevant category is that of extra-territorial Romanian citizens living mainly in Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova. Romania offers citizenship for the residents of territories which were part of the interwar Greater Romania through a simplified process of naturalization. The preferential procedure implies that citizenship can be obtained even without having residence in the country. Trans-border Romanian citizens enter the population register when they receive an ID card. Consequently, the Ministry of Internal Affairs - Directorate for Persons' Record and Database Management holds a database on: a) the (officially registered) emigrant stock, and b) the new Romanian citizens residing in the neighboring countries (Ukraine, Republic of Moldova).

Our first recommendation is to integrate the population register in the statistical data production system. The most relevant data refer to the following groups: a) officially registered emigrant stock; b) new Romanian citizens residing in neighboring countries (Ukraine, Republic of Moldova) registered in the population register.

These actions certainly require the modification of the Law No. 266/2009 on statistical data production system and a close cooperation between the National Institute of Statistics and the Ministry of Internal Affairs. All national authorities and research institutes engaged in the issue of international migration could benefit from these actions. The main problem could be the unwillingness of data owners (relevant departments of the MIA) to share data, which could be solved only by a strong political authorization.

Another relevant area concerning the improvement of the Romanian data production system is the use of the registers of foreigners for statistical purposes. The Ministry of Internal Affairs should transmit data or provide access to these registers. If NIS has direct access to the registers of foreigners, the result will be a rich and relatively reliable data on immigrant stock, which is completely missing currently from datasets on migration delivered by the National Institute of Statistics.

For a more integrated data production system, besides the modification of the Law no. 266/2009 on statistical data production system, a strong political (governmental) support is needed too. Otherwise the lack of interest and the refusal of data owners might hinder the entire process.

5.2. Integrated and internationally standardized definitions of different migrant groups

For a better integrated and internationally harmonized data production system the *definitions of the population and different migrant groups should be revised*.

In Romania, following the change of the political regime, the statistical and administrative definitions of the term "population" have become highly incongruent. The lack of a consistently used definition for the country's population has a decisive effect on the Romanian data production system. The definitions of immigrants and emigrants (used by the National Institute of Statistics) follow the logic of the administrative (legal) definition of the population, and as a consequence, they are not at all in line with the Eurostat recommendations. *Emigrants* (see in the exhaustive survey carried out by NIS and the Ministry of Internal Affairs) are defined as Romanian citizens who leave the country in agreement with Romanian authorities, in order to settle abroad. It would be reasonable to use the "statistical" definition of the population (e.g. the totality of residents in Romania) for administrative purposes too. Of course, an additional register of the Romanian citizens might be also maintained, but the duality of the definition of the country's population should be shortly eliminated. The definitions of immigrants and emigrants should be also modified to be in line with Eurostat recommendations and international standards.

5.3. Recommendation concerning Household Labor Force Survey

As a next proposal, it would be very useful **to attach an additional module to the LFS. This module would** focus on the emigration experiences of present household members, the household members living and working abroad, and the intentions of the population to emigrate (work abroad). Regular use of this module would provide very useful data on the dynamics of emigration from Romania. The pilot study carried out by the Hungarian and Serbian colleagues in the framework of the SEEMIG project could be also capitalized in this sense.

The last proposal is the **regular monitoring and analysis of the LFS surveys carried out in the main destination countries of the Romanian migration**. Due to the fact that Romania is first of all an emigration country, for the purposes of analyzing the Romanian migration, not only the Romanian LFS survey can be interesting, but Romanian migrants could be studied through the LFS surveys performed in the main receiving countries too. For instance, in Italy or in Spain, a considerable part of the work-force is constituted by Romanians. These surveys are of special interest because Romanian LFS surveys do not contain any specific questions regarding migration (e.g. Have you ever worked abroad? Do you plan to work abroad?). The Romanian Institute for Research on National Minorities is profoundly committed (and is competent) to take steps towards meeting this objective.

ANNEX 1: Stakeholder events, scholarly analyses and policy documents used to develop the strategy proposal.

<p>The SEEMIG strategy proposal has been developed using/referring to the following stakeholder events, scholarly analyses and policy documents, detailed SEEMIG analyses:</p>
<p>SEEMIG STAKEHOLDER EVENTS</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training – January 20, 2014. <i>Participating Institutions: National Institute for Statistics, Covasna County Council, Department for Social Protection - Municipality of Sfantu Gheorghe, National Labour Force Agency, Ministry of Education – Covasna County Inspectorate,</i> • Foresight Exercise – November 27-28, 2013. <i>Participating Institutions: National Institute for Statistics, Covasna County Council, Department for Social Protection - Municipality of Sfantu Gheorghe, National Labour Force Agency, Ministry of Education – Covasna County Inspectorate, Sapientia University, Babes-Bolyai University</i> • Master Class – June 25, 2014 <i>Participating Institutions: National Institute for Statistics, Harghita County Council, National Labour Force Agency, Ministry of Education</i> • Focus Group – April 28, 2014 <i>Participating Institutions: Ministry of Internal Affairs, Babes-Bolyai University, Department for Social Protection - Municipality of Cluj Napoca, National Health Insurance House, PATRIR</i>
<p>REFERENCED SCHOLARLY ANALYSES AND POLICY DOCUMENTS</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADMINISTRAȚIA PREZIDENTIALĂ: Riscuri și inechități sociale în România • Ministry of Economics: National Strategy for Competitiveness 2014-2020. • IOM: Migration in Romania. A Country Profile 2008 • Alexe, I., & Păunescu, B. (Eds.). (2011). <i>Studiu asupra fenomenului imigrației în România. Integrarea străinilor în societatea românească.</i> București: Fundația Soros România. • Cervinski, D. (2011). Migrație și integrare. Fenomenul imigraționist și impactul programelor de integrare asupra resortisanților țărilor terțe în România. <i>Sfera Politicii</i>, XIX(12/2011), 45-55. • Ghețău, V. (2012). <i>Drama noastră demografică. Populația României la recensământul din octombrie 2011.</i> București: Institutului de Proiecte pentru Inovație și Dezvoltare
<p>DETAILED SEEMIG ANALYSES</p>

SEEMIG project outputs are available at <http://seemig.eu/index.php/downloads-project-outputs>:

- Conceptual framework for modelling longer term migratory, labour market and human capital processes
- Dynamic historical analysis of migratory, labour market and human capital processes – country report for Romania, local chapter on Municipality of Sfantu Gheorghe and Harghita County
- Dynamic historical analysis of migratory, labour market and human capital processes - synthesis report
- Analysis of existing migratory data production systems and data sources – country report for *Romania*, local chapter on Municipality of Sfantu Gheorghe and Harghita County
- Action Plan to improve and enhance the migratory data production system and data sources in *Romania*
- Analysis of existing migratory data production systems and data sources – synthesis report
- Surveying emigration - report on the first stage of the pilot study in Hungary and Serbia
- Comparative analysis of existing major population projections
- Population projections and forecasts in Hungary and Slovakia
- Foresight synthesis report